

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are now pending in the application. Applicant would first like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's counsel during the telephonic interview conducted on April 7, 2009 and for the courtesies further extended to Applicant's counsel on April 21, 2009. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite language that encapsulates the features which the Examiner seemed to agree is not taught by Kentish (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,417). Applicant has made similar amendment to claims 4 and 13. Furthermore, Applicant has amended various dependent claims for purposes of maintaining antecedent basis only. Finally, Applicant has added new dependent claim 15. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Once again Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's counsel during the telephonic interview. During the interview, claim 1 was discussed. The focus of the interview dealt with the newly added limitation, directed to

a deciding unit, responsive to authorization parameter identifying information which identifies a subset of respective parameters that the simple control unit is authorized to modify among the respective parameters indicated in the certain detailed setting information, which restricts a user of the simple control unit from modifying respective parameters that are not among the subset of respective parameters. (emphasis added).

Applicant contended that Kentish did not contain a restricted control panel, wherein a user of the simple control unit is restricted from modifying control parameters that are not among a subset of respective parameters. Applicant further contended that in the claimed invention, the simple control unit may be set to have certain functions restricted,

so that an amateur user may operate the system without making adjustments to settings that only a technical person would be allowed to modify. As a result, an agreement was reached that claim 1, as currently amended, may contain limitations not taught by the cited references but any amendment would still necessitate further search and consideration.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kentish (U.S. Pat. No. 5,778,417). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, the Examiner and Applicant agreed that the language in claim 1, as currently amended, may be sufficient to overcome the cited references. In response to the interview, Applicant has amended claim 1 so that it includes:

a deciding unit, responsive to authorization parameter identifying information which identifies a subset of respective parameters that the simple control unit is authorized to modify among the respective parameters indicated in the certain detailed setting information, which restricts a user of the simple control unit from modifying respective parameters that are not among the subset of respective parameters." (emphasis added).

It is Applicant's contention that Kentish does not teach a mixing unit that receives authorization parameter identifying information and restricts a user's ability to apply control parameters that are not among the predetermined set of modifiable parameters. Thus, Applicant contends that the language "the deciding unit... which restricts a user of the simple control unit from modifying respective parameters that are not among the subset of respective parameters" is at least one point of distinction between claim 1 and

the cited reference. Applicant has made similar amendment to claims 4 and 13 and respectfully submits that these claims also define over the cited reference.

Kentish generally relates to a networked digital mixer that can have multiple control panels. The Kentish device appears to be programmable, in that a user can map the function of one controller to effect multiple functions. It does not appear, however, that Kentish teaches restricting the user of the simple control unit from modifying parameters that are not within a subset of respective parameters.

Claims 4 and 13 have been amended to clarify a limitation that is directed to restricting the ability to modify certain parameters, based on a subset of modifiable parameters. In particular, claim 4 now reads in part:

wherein the mixing unit a) receives the authorization parameter identifying information and b) restricts operating a function of the simple control unit to only the authorization parameter identifying information, such that a user of the simple control unit is restricted from applying control parameters that are not among the predetermined subset. (emphasis added)

Claim 13 reads in pertinent part:

"the mixing unit a) receives the authorization parameters from the first control unit and b) restricts operating a function of the control unit by the second control unit and in response to the authorization parameters, such that a user of the second control unit is restricted from applying control parameters that are not among said selected subset." (emphasis added).

As can be appreciated, both claim 4 and claim 13 have limitations directed to restricting a user from modifying parameters that are not within a set of modifiable parameters. As mentioned, Kentish does not teach the above stated limitations, as Kentish does not contemplate restricting a set of functions based on the subset of modifiable parameters, such that a user of a control unit cannot apply control

parameters that are not contained in the predetermined/selected subset. Accordingly, claims 4 and 13 patentably define over the cited reference. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 4 and 13 as well as the claims depending therefrom.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kentish in view of Iwamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,816,833). Claim 14 stands rejected as being obvious over Kentish. Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments made to claims 1 and 4, from which claims 14 and 7 depend respectively, the rejections have been rendered moot. Accordingly applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 7 and 14.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 15 is newly added and depends from claim 1. As discussed, Applicant believes that claim 1, as amended, has overcome the cited references. Accordingly, as claim 15 depends from claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 patentably defines over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 22, 2009

By:

/Gregory A. Stobbs/_____
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No.: 28,764

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GAS/TDM/TSE/vlm]

14475986.1